

Application Number: 10/647,411  
In reply to Office Action dated October 4, 2006  
Page 9 of 10

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JAN 30 2007

#### REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on October 4, 2006. Claims 1-31 are pending in the application and are rejected. With this amendment, claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 29, and 31 are amended. Claims 7 and 21 are canceled. No new claims are added. Accordingly, claims 1-6, 8-20, and 22-31 remain pending.

The pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owensby in view of Official Notices. The amended claims now includes features not shown or suggested in Owensby or the prior art. Therefore these features would be missing from any proposed combination of the references.

For example, the independent claims have been amended to include the features of an identifier "wherein the identifier includes an alias selected by the user from a plurality of available aliases" and "wherein the user profile is unique to the selected alias." The Office Action on page 4 takes official notice that "It is old and well known to use alias in order to easily identify a person, a place, etc." Applicants submit that amended features are more than assigning an alias to ease identification.

Adding the alias as stated in the Office action does not meet the terms of the amended claims. The prior art does not show or suggest "an alias selected by the user from a plurality of available aliases." Owensby, and the old and well known prior art, teach only that one identifier is assigned to a phone, which is not user-selected, and it is not selected from a plurality of available aliases. Further the prior art does not show or suggest "the user profile is unique to the selected alias." Owensby and the old and well known prior art teach only of one profile per phone, and it does not recognize or suggest a benefit of a user selecting the "alias . . . from a plurality of available aliases" to change the profile of the mobile device.

Further the prior art does not show or suggest the amended claims because, in part, it does not recognize the problem solved by the amended claims. For example, the amended claims provide an improvement over the prior art by permitting the user to create more particular user profiles to meet the users specific needs at the specific time the user is operating the mobile device. For example, a user may create a business alias to receive advertisements directed specifically to his business needs. This business profile can suggest business type restaurants as opposed to family-style restaurants. Instead, the user may create a family alias to receive advertisements such as those directed at family-style restaurants. The user, depending on the role the user is playing at the time of the



RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JAN 30 2007

012

Application Number: 10/647,411  
In reply to Office Action dated October 4, 2006  
Page 10 of 10

operation of the mobile device, can select a particular alias to receive specific advertisements. In addition, alias can be created and selected by third parties sharing the mobile device from the first phone. For example, an adult may have a particular set of aliases and the adult's teenager may have another alias. The options are not possible, and they are not suggested, in the prior art.

Because the features of the amended independent claims 1, 15, 29, and 31 are not shown or suggested in Owensby and the prior art separately, they cannot be found in any proposed combination of the prior art. Further, claims 2-6 and 8-14, claims 16-20 and 22-28, and claim 30 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 15, and 29, respectively. By virtue of their dependency, these claims are patentably distinguishable from the prior art also.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of the objections and rejections, and for favorable action and allowance of the application.

#### CONCLUSION

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at 612-607-7340. If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees including fees for any extension of time, to Deposit Account No. 50-1901 (Reference No. 60021-376302).

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
Rudolph P. Hoffmann, Reg. No. 38,187  
Customer No. 29838

Oppenheimer Wolff & Donnelly LLP  
45 South Seventh Street, Suite 3300  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1609  
Telephone: (612) 607-7340